

Farm Products Marketing Agencies Bill

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I point out that strong language is a part of the tenor of debate. While we pattern ourselves after the mother of parliaments, I do not advocate that we go as far as they do. Not long ago an opposition member in the United Kingdom Parliament called the Prime Minister a swine. I am not suggesting that expression or trying to persuade the hon. member to use it. I have not yet read *Hansard* to see what Mr. Speaker King did with respect to that statement. However, it is an agricultural term.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point of order and reply to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) now that he has raised the mother of parliaments. Erskine May, who of course is familiar with Parliament and has written 17 editions based on the precedents and practices of Parliament, says at page 465 of his revised edition that "The imputation of false or unavowed motives" is unparliamentary language. I suggest to the hon. member who raised this example that he at least read the representations made by the people who are experts on that Parliament, in order to determine what is parliamentary and what is unparliamentary. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to strong language—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Olson: —but there are specific examples—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Olson: —of unparliamentary language listed in May and Beauchesne.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The House will recognize that this is a most delicate and difficult area for the Chair to make a ruling. I seek the co-operation of all hon. members. When a member of the House rises on a point of order and argues that his reputation as a member has been attacked, it must be listened to very carefully. I am willing to do that. I appeal to all hon. members to realize the difficulty in which this type of exchange puts the Chair. I do not want to curtail the right of the hon. member to contribute to the debate. I am trying to bear in mind the tradition of strong language which is characteristic of our system plus the equally strong and more important tradition of not impugning the reputation of or attributing motives to an hon. member. I know that the

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek is as aware of these traditions as is the Chair. I seek his co-operation and the co-operation of all hon. members.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, to be called a fool by a fool is no indictment!

Mr. Gundlock: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in this House we listen to "yeas" and "nays," but very seldom do we have to listen to a Minister of Agriculture who says "I, I".

Mr. Yewchuk: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) does not like what is being said, what he is really doing is obstructing the opposition in putting their views forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that is a point of order.

Mr. McIntosh: Your Honour is quite right: I was not imputing motives; I was imputing stupidity. This minister shows complete disregard for the democratic, parliamentary system which we have. He believes that of the 264 members who were elected in 1968, he alone is aware of what the agricultural producers want and what is good for them. He thinks that he alone in this House knows what is good for the agricultural industry. That is stupid, Mr. Speaker.

● (8:20 p.m.)

The second statement to which I want to refer appears in the minister's speech where he said—

Mr. Olson: I am not going to listen to you any more; I have more important things to do.

Mr. McIntosh: You will, after the next election. The minister said, as reported at page 6997 of *Hansard* of May 14 last:

If I had not been closely associated with the development of the bill I would conclude from their remarks that we are proposing a law which opens up a whole new area of public authority, which provides vast new power to the government in the area of marketing farm produce, power which does not already exist. This, of course, is absolutely wrong.

To paraphrase the minister, he is saying that the opposition are misconstruing the intention of the bill in that we dare to suggest that the bill has anything to do with a whole new area of public authority which provides vast new power to the government, power